THEOLOGY

VOL. LI AUGUST, 1948 No. 338

Editorial

THE apathy of the British people in face of the menace of atomic warfare may be more apparent than real. Our unimaginativeness preserves us from a state of nervous apprehension, but who that thinks at all can fail to be aware of the pressing danger? It is better to be phlegmatic than hysterical. No good purpose would be served by frantic agitations. Our statesmen are doing the most that can be done to bring atomic energy under international control and to meet the dark alternative. We do better to uphold them with our prayers and confidence than to embarrass them with pin-pricks.

This is not to say that thought should be averted from the threatening disaster. We need much more steady looking at the facts and endeavour to understand what they portend. How can they be understood in the light of God's purpose for the world? This must be the overriding question for Christians. Guidance and illumination are forthcoming, though they have not yet permeated far. There are, to begin with, the Report of the British Council of Churches' Commission, *The Era of Atomic Power*, and the Report of the Church Assembly Commission, *The Church and the Atom*. Both these have been attacked, not only by naive pacifists, but by others who cannot overcome the craving for a simple and straightforward lead by the Church. The approach of the first Report may be described as realistic and existential, that of the second as classical and traditional. But they do not differ substantially in their conclusions, and both go to show that, whether we like it or not, there is no way out. It is easy to criticize, especially the academic and clerical tone of *The Church and the Atom*; but since we do not see our way to criticism that is constructive and would propound different conclusions, it is wiser as well as more generous to forbear.

The most agonized attempt to grasp all the nettles is that of Mr Middleton Murry in *The Free Society*. The force of Mr Murry's argument is not greatly affected by his theological blind spots. Both its strength and its limitations are well brought out by Prof. D. M. Mackinnon and Dr Oldham in the supplements about it which they contributed to the *Christian News-Letter* (Nos. 310 and 312), and these should be read alongside the book itself.

Other worthwhile contributions that have come to our notice are Mr D. R. Davies's *Theology and the Atomic Age* (Latimer House, 5s.), chapter vii of the Archbishop of York's *Watchman, What of the Night?* (Hodder and Stoughton, 6s.), and Dr H. F. Lovell Cocks's *The Church and the Atomic Age* (Independent Press, 9d.). All these seek to interpret our historic destiny in the light of the Biblical revelation and to indicate the true lines of Christian response. The Archbishop cites Prof.

Burkitt's essay on "The Eschatological Idea in the Gospel" in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, and this certainly deserves to be read again at the present time. Burkitt pointed out that Christianity survived the ruin of political Judaism, and later the break up of the Roman civilization, because "it had been organized for a time of catastrophe rather than for a time of peace."

Whatever possibilities are closed, the way is now open for the Church to learn again how to live in a time of catastrophe or, as one of the reviews in this number puts it, how to live without a future. We particularly recommend Dr Lovell Cocks's pamphlet, because he shows how this lesson may be learned at the level of the local church. He writes primarily for Congregationalists, but when he says that the "Church Meeting" may become again the most significant gathering in the world he says what other churches are beginning to discover too.

* * * * *

The members of the Lambeth Conference will have found *Lambeth Conferences (1867-1930)* (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.) and *Lambeth Occasional Reports 1931-8* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) serviceable, not to say indispensable, and those who undertake to discuss the Report of the present Conference will hardly do so to advantage unless they are acquainted with the background and antecedents here provided. Scarcely less useful, though less official, is the Bishop of Chichester's *Christian Unity: The Anglican Position* (Hodder and Stoughton, 6s.). He traces the relations between the Church of England and other churches from the time of the Reformation to the present day. The facts of the case, still far too little known, are stated with admirable objectivity. As Artifex remarked in the *Manchester Guardian*, "It is curious how writers of the Oxford Movement school have obscured for most people the view held by Anglican scholars for four centuries." The Church of England has had a consistent position which is firmly grounded in principle. Our feet have been set, not in a wilderness or a maze, but in a large room. In so far as attempts to confine us more closely proceed from ignorance of the meaning of our formularies or of the principles on which our forefathers acted, this book supplies the necessary corrective.

Reunion: From Above or Below?

THE unpopularity of the bishops with the clergy is no new phenomenon. "With the exception of one brief period, when the seven bishops were sent to the Tower by James II, the bishops have never been popular in England," observes the Archbishop of York.[1] To-day it appears likely that another ancient hostility within the Church may flare up again, in a new form of the war between the friars and the seculars.[2] In the eyes of the parish clergy a host of sinister figures, concentrated in London but with outposts in every diocesan office, rush in and out of the parishes as the compliant agents of an unsympathetic episcopate. They are the growing army of "specialists": organizing secretaries, educational experts, diocesan missioners, factory chaplains, broadcasting directors, inspectors, bureaucrats—sinister portents of the Church's capitulation to the spirits of "big-business" and "planned economy," the twin evils of our age which, elsewhere living in enmity, are safely married in the Church. This ill brood have in common with their episcopal masters at least two characteristics, scorn for the parish clergy and a tendency to be ecumenical. Ignorant of the steady drudgery of the parochial round, they are for ever pointing out the inadequacy of the parish system to meet the needs of the day; remote from the heart-breaking slowness of pastoral work, they are for ever proposing bright ideas which, if it were not for the obscurantism of the parochial clergy (they suggest), would lead rapidly to religious revival; oblivious to the stubborn facts of local life, they plan unity on paper and convert England in conferences.

Such at least would seem to be the picture, if a recent article in this journal by Mr Pawley represents as wide a consensus of clerical opinion as its author claims,[3] and anyone who knows the parish clergy would agree that Mr Pawley but said in print what many a ruridecanal chapter mutters every month. And nobody would deny that such opinions, whether well founded or ill, point to a sickness in the Church. If it is only partially true that large numbers of clergy mistrust their leaders, suspect their agents and resist reunion—then something is wrong indeed. But what—and who—is wrong? The purpose of this article is to offer another line of approach by one whose ministry has alternated between being a "specialist" and a parish priest, who is now immured in a London office doing "ecumenical work" but who was too recently a vicar in the industrial provinces to have forgotten what such as he now is looked like from there. Above all it is offered in the sincere belief that these two forms of the ministry are—or can be—*one* ministry. If I turned parish priest again to-morrow, what are the things I should attempt to do so that the parochial ministry should be ecumenical? What contribution does the local ministry bring to the ecumenical movement? These are the questions which burn my mind alike when I consider the point

[1] *The Claims of the Church of England*, p. 114.

[2] *Cf.* J. R. H. Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century*, pp. 390 *ff.*

[3] See "Some Practical Difficulties of Reunion," by Bernard Pawley, in THEOLOGY for April, 1948.

of view which Mr Pawley represented and when I look forward with hope and fear to the outcome of Lambeth and Amsterdam.

The field is vast and complicated. A short article can only touch upon some of the territory. I propose to leave on one side direct discussion of the tension implied in the title of the chapter of the Archbishop of York's book (already referred to), " The Bishop and 'the Bishops.' " To attempt the justification of the entire episcopate would be foolhardy if it were not already impious. "It is God that justifieth." But I believe the aspects I do wish to discuss may throw some light upon an uneasy relationship which admittedly exists. I would concentrate only on two points—the meaning of the "ecumenical movement" and its bearing upon *local* church life, whether Anglican or nonconformist.

I. The Meaning of the Ecumenical Movement.—In the first place, it is wholly to misread the history of the ecumenical movement to suppose that it is simply concerned with reunion. Its origins and its impulse lie in evangelization. As Archbishop William Temple said of "the great new fact of our era" in his now often quoted enthronement sermon: "It is the result of the great missionary enterprise of the last hundred and fifty years . . . the aim . . . was to preach the Gospel to as many individuals as could be reached. . . . Almost incidentally the great world fellowship has arisen."[1] The first characteristic of "ecumenicity" as defined by those historical events which comprise the "ecumenical movement" is that it is *evangelistic*. Not for nothing is Edinburgh 1910 regarded as a key date.

Secondly, the same attention to facts reveals the *Life and Work* movement, an expression of *common* Christian responsibility for the life of mankind as such, whether within or without the Church. Stockholm, 1925, differed from Oxford, 1937, in being much more "practical." Drink, sex-relations, gambling, were discussed at Stockholm by Christians working actively in the Churches' social responsibility as the 1920s understood it. If the Oxford conference faced a deeper crisis, in which the fundamental theology of Church, Community (*Volk*) and State had to be faced, it remains true that both piecemeal social action and radical social thinking are true elements of the ecumenical movement.

Thirdly, it has become increasingly clear in recent years that *shared suffering* is perhaps the most transforming element in the ecumenical experience. For hundreds of thousands of Christians—and non-Christians—in Europe and Asia the ecumencial movement *is* the World Council's Reconstruction Department (Christian Reconstruction in Europe in this country; Church World Service in America). Most of the member Churches of the World Council joined it in the darkest years of the war because their sufferings revealed to them the existence of a unity in Christ for which no adequate expression existed.

The whole nature of Christian unity is thought of wrongly if it is thought of in separation from these other elements of ecumenical

[1] *The Church Looks Forward*, p. 2.

experience. It is no accident that the great figures of international Christian conferences keep on turning up, at Madras, at Oxford, at Edinburgh. It is not simply (even if partly) because they like conferences, but because they realize that the conferences are ultimately all about the same thing. That "thing" is perhaps best defined as the *renewal* of the Church. Essentially, the ecumenical movement stands for the recognition that evangelism, unity and responsibility for society, entwined under the Cross, are the indispensable marks of a Church which would be renewed into the likeness of its Lord.

Finally, the familiar criticism that the ecumenical movement consists of leaders who have got out of touch with their followers is largely accounted for by the fact that, at these various conferences and in all that goes on between them, these leaders *met each other.* Friendship, with that extra dimension that lies in Christian friendship, still stands, when the last minutes have been roneoed and the last report sold as a publisher's remainder, the real stuff of the ecumenical movement.

II. These facts are decisive for the bearing of the Ecumenical Movement upon the life of the local church.—Let us take the last fact first. Clearly the first act of "local ecumenicity" is for separated Christians really to meet. The parish priest's main problem is priorities. Since I cannot do all I ought to in any case, what shall I leave out? Is the time it would take away from visiting, study or sermon-preparation really worth the effort to get to know the local nonconformists? For most kinds of "fraternal" the answer is frankly, "No !" True, it is relatively easy to get beyond that naïve stage reflected in such remarks as "The lesson was read by a Baptist, and I must say he read it quite well," to the more or less regular "ministers' fraternal," with its veiled hostility in references to "our Free Church brethren," and the Methodist Superintendent thanking the local spike for his paper on " Intercommunion" in the tone of a Socialist mayor proposing, with difficulty, the health of the Tory M.P. But such advance is hardly worth registering unless it leads on to something much more costly and profound. A recent publication of the Church Union on *Co-operation with Nonconformists* contains some valuable advice, even if the tone of the whole pamphlet suggests that a companion brochure might be entitled "How to be Friendly with Pandas." But its remarks (on p. 4) on "Charity" and "Frankness" are much to the point. Even so, the conscientious parish priest (and it is the tragedy of many existing fraternals that those who are keenest on their own pastoral responsibilities stay away from them) will not be likely to take the time necessary deeply to understand his neighbours of other traditions unless he is convinced that all his own deepest concerns will owe to it a benefit comparable to that which they owe, for example, to the time that he spends at his prayers. The first thing to realize is that living fellowship is no easier to practise than living prayer, and for the same reason. In both, the soul may meet the living God. Both take time, honesty, love and discipline.

This conviction that in a Christian brother I meet Christ is the only compelling motive for ecumenicity. As Dr L. A. Zander, speaking

out of the profundity of Eastern Orthodox Church loyalty, has finely said: "Thus the image of Christ which every Christian bears becomes manifest; *Christophoria* becomes *Christophania*; such is the brief formula which defines the essence of the ecumenical process."[1] Once this is grasped a host of things fall naturally into place. Let us look again at the characteristics of the ecumenical movement.

(1) *Evangelism.*—Much of the staleness of our reunion situation to-day is because we have scarcely begun to tackle evangelism in the ecumenical context of unity and responsibility. It is so much simpler to pretend one's own Church is the only one that exists. The temptation is all the stronger because evangelism issues from and leads to a worshipping community. Nevertheless, it is treason for anyone who has glimpsed the ecumenical insight to evangelize in total disregard of his separated fellow-Christians. I do not pretend to know the answer. I do know that since I saw Father Kelly and W. R. Maltby share an S.C.M. platform at Swanwick I have known that men can proclaim the Gospel together without betraying one iota of what they hold to be true. And I have a shrewd suspicion that when we do begin to tackle evangelism ecumenically in the parishes we shall discover that the real difficulties will not be the ones that scare us so in theory. And I do not mind betting that if the new housing areas which may yet be built in our lifetime are tackled on the unexamined and unrepented basis of denominational rivalry, they will prove singularly unfruitful mission fields. I do not know—in those circumstances—what we ought to do; but I do know that it is time that *together* we are beginning to find out.

Responsibility for society at once raises problems which joint evangelism alone can tackle. In modern England, however much we yelp that we are the national Church when others tread on our toes, an Anglican approach to factories, professional groupings, local and national authorities, has got to come to living terms with non-conformists, both Protestant and Roman.

The whole subject calls not only for deeper thought and prayer, but even more urgently for courageous but responsible action which will provide matter for that thought and prayer which we still lack. Much of what we need to know we could learn from the mission field. Several more Asian and African priests on our parish staffs would teach us this—and much besides.

(2) *Unity.*—The most usual and often the least rewarding activity of local co-operation is the exchange of clerical broadsides on Church order. The most profitable interdenominational discussions I have engaged in have never been deliberately polemical. Joint study of the Bible, of the Fathers, of basic doctrines like the atonement or grace or justification, not only demonstrate some unsuspected cross-bench coalitions, but are generally the only basis upon which the still divisive issues of Church order can profitably be discussed.

The essential is *theological seriousness*. The only sound reason for

[1] See "The Essence of the Ecumenical Movement" in *Student World*, second quarter, 1937.

discussing theology, whether denominationally or interdenominationally, is if it is a search for truth. Nothing could be more futile than a group which wants to be "ecumenical" and discusses theology *faute de mieux* (except a group which discusses theology *faute de mieux* and does not even want to be ecumenical). In this connexion it is essential that unity discussion should be well informed. Mr Pawley will forgive me if I point out that his article at various points seriously misrepresents the Archbishop's Cambridge sermon. He refers (p. 144) to "amalgamation," to "precipitate action" and to "receiving into the Church the churchmanship of" certain Free Church failings, whereas the whole purpose of the Archbishop's proposal is to postpone discussion of organic reunion and devote considerable time to the limited question of the acceptance of episcopacy into the system of the Free Churches, or of some of them. As to the conversations to this end being "clandestine," the Churches are not without their Molotovs and public diplomacy has its drawbacks.

All this is clerical activity. That is much of the trouble. Until a far wider and more earnest practice takes place of "the group which meets in the vicar's study meeting and praying with a group which meets at the Methodist minister's (as recently advocated in this journal by the Rector of Wigan) there will be only precocious and unbalanced agreements to record. I know from experience both the pathetic triviality and the moving grandeur of such personal encounter between ordinary Church members.

(3) *Responsibility for Society.*—The non-churchgoers may be forgiven for denouncing, though we, but for God's mercy, could hardly expect to be forgiven for practising, ecclesiastical dissension whilst the world drifts on to annihilation. But the point at which denunciation is proved facile and our penitence put to the test is in local life. The stubborn and subtle evils which add up to cosmic disaster meet the local Church in the corruption of home life, in crowded housing conditions, in the petty black market, in selfishly restrictive working practices and exploitive employing practices—none of them purely "denominational" problems. A growing number of local councils of churches bears witness to an intuition of where responsibility lies. Yet too many "councils of churches" are ineffective, either because they are not manned by people who really see the point of them or because they tackle the wrong-sized area. The former is only overcome by a vast increase in the number of people who have grasped the ecumenical insight in its wholeness, not being content only with superficial "common witness" on Good Friday or desultory, clerical discussions on unity or protests to the town council, but are moved by a deep, unified, pervasive concern for the *renewal* of the Church. To discover the right-sized area for co-operation calls for a closer analysis of the *effective* unit of real local life and a flexible strategy of the Christian forces within it. Some things are tackled at city or even diocesan level; others in a single city ward. And here, perhaps, more than anywhere, the energy, experience and leadership of the Christian laity is the most important and most neglected factor.

The active outpouring of a common Christian compassion blesses

those who give and those who receive as nothing else has the power to do. It is only that there is not enough of it.

These considerations are haltingly advanced by one who has lived with them for some years both locally and "centrally." But I advance them because I believe that Lambeth and Amsterdam will be (respectively) sounding brass and a clanging cymbal unless there is the response of *renewal* of the Church "from below."

The title of this paper is indeed susceptible of another interpretation —"Reunion: From Above or Below?" The Prince of Darkness tried his hand at reunion schemes in Germany and Japan. Mr Pawley and his friends do well to remind us that there is a guise in which "Christian unity" can be the corruption of the Church. The inferior clergy are right to demand of "those above" that their leadership shall be without compromise of principle, sensitive to the earthy realities of the Church's pilgrimage and the *corporate* response of leaders and specialists with the great mass of the local faithful, priest and people alike. But together we wait upon the mercy of Him who comes from above, who alone can say, "Behold, I make all things new" —and do it.

OLIVER TOMKINS.

Heresy in New Testament Times

THE New Testament writings were "occasional" in the sense that they were produced to meet contemporary needs. The same is true of most of the deliberate statements of doctrine contained in them. Therefore the understanding of the writings and their teachings, implicit and explicit, requires that one should neither read into them more than their authors intended nor interpret them without reference to the circumstances of their composition and reception.

The occasional nature of the statements of doctrine does not mean that the doctrine itself was occasional. Particular circumstances were more likely to evoke the expression of that which was implicit than to produce new doctrine. The form of that expression might be affected by the situation or by the background and outlook of the writer. Its interpretation might be influenced by subjective, environmental or controversial factors. Of this possibility the New Testament writers are rarely aware. Their statements seem to them to be adequate to the situation under consideration and future possibilities are of little importance in view of the imminence of the end of the world-order. But while they had a sense of their own responsibility in writing, and an increasing awareness of the need for loyalty to a central core of doctrine, they had no idea that their own writings would bear the weight of Scripture with divine and literal authority. Before the end of the New Testament period this opinion would begin to be formed not only by the orthodox but also by those, as indicated in 2 Peter iii, 16, who would misinterpret the writings for the support of their own views.

Developments in the Form-Criticism of the Gospels have shown the value of the effort to understand the situation in which were

formulated the earliest Oral Traditions behind the written sources of the Gospels. There has been a tendency to overestimate the influence of the situation upon the content, as well as the form, of those traditions. For the catechetical needs were after all secondary to the primary function of witness to One whose human life was well within the memory of many of the members of the primitive Church. The content of the message was bound to be dominated by the historic facts of the Christ whom they knew and checked by the presence of witnesses contemporary with Him.

In much the same way, while the study of the "situation" behind the production of the several writings will throw considerable light upon the purpose and meaning of the writers of the New Testament, yet one has to realize how convinced they were that even more important than the writer and the readers was the message about a Historic Person and His teaching, with all its manifold implications.

Therefore, even in the most controversial writings the main purpose is less to define and refute some erring opinions—most of these are described with what is to us surprising vagueness and met by denunciation rather than argument—but to concentrate upon some aspect of the Christian Truth. Details of the nature of some doctrinal trouble being discussed might even be taken more or less for granted between the author and his readers. They were not worthy of consideration comparable with that accorded to the true teaching and could be considered of minor importance compared with the imminent fact of the Parousia. It is an interesting feature that whereas in the earlier writings a real attempt is made to consider difficulties and meet them, in the later writings such as the Pastoral Epistles, Apocalypse, 2 Peter and Jude, for example, there is little argument. The errorists are denounced and any hope of their reclamation decreases as the period advances.

Sometimes, as in Colossians and 1 Corinthians, the Apostle is so intent on showing the Christological implications of some wrong idea and its orthodox counterpart that one might almost assume the readers or the errorists to have been already aware of something of these implications. This assumption has led to the too ready identification of such errors as first-century examples of what were later to become the elaborated forms of Gnosticism. But it is a mistake to attribute too much importance and elaboration to ideas which were to the Apostle's readers or to the errorists simply pieces of interesting speculation or of contemporary "broad-mindedness" in religious matters. Similarity of expression is not evidence of identity of ideas, nor can points of partial resemblance outweigh the omission of features central to Gnostic thought.

It is unfortunate that much of the information about the early forms of heresies which is given by the early Fathers is coloured by this tendency to read back into the past the features of systems current at the time of writing. This was only natural. They felt the value of being able to point to Apostolic support for the condemnation of the errors. And the increase of external hostility and internal difficulties had accelerated the activity of traditions about early heresies and

heretics. For example, Justin Martyr's account, in his *Apology* i. 26 and 56, of Simon Magus has some useful information but it is affected by the tradition which had built up the picture of the "arch-heretic," and by the developed teaching of Simon's followers in the second century.

The early heresiologists emphasize individuals rather than movements of thought and tendencies, for in their day individual leaders of heresy were easily recognizable and condemnable. But in the New Testament times the errors were more vague and fluid, and in the early days less connected with individuals. The converts of the Hellenistic world were people of a syncretistic age with complex faiths. They were inclined to interpret the simplicity of their new faith along lines already familiar to them and this was particularly so where points of the Christian worship and doctrine seemed to have some similarity to the mystery religions. Persecution and conflict over heresies had not yet arisen to emphasize the need for a protective wall in matters of thought between those inside and those outside the Church and this is clearly shown in the trouble at Colossæ. They had been brought up in a world in which religion and ethics were often thought of as things quite separate. They might appreciate the need for higher standards of conduct but not the Christian link between right conduct and right thought, and novelties in speculation were always attractive to the Greek mind. In those early days the influence of the Jewish and Gentile background upon the new converts was far greater than the early Fathers indicate.

By their time also the definition and crystallization of doctrine had so developed that they could not adequately allow for an important and primary factor in the early development of heresy. This was the naturally incomplete definition of doctrine within the primitive Church. There were not only many minor implications of the Christian faith to be worked out as the needs arose but many major points which had to await expression. The doctrines of the Pre-existence of Christ, of the Church, of the Eternal Life, of the Virgin Birth—to quote but a few examples—were not explicit in the early days and the development of their expression is an interesting feature of the New Testament. The fact that much of this development took place in response to apologetic and instructional needs indicates how possible it was for men to err when filling up for themselves the gaps in Christian thought as expressed already.

In Judaism the disciples had been a people with a Book. They had become accustomed to accept rulings and teaching as authoritative because they were based on a Divine and written Law. In dealing with the Gentile world they had the added difficulty of instructing people who knew little or nothing of that Law unless they had been attached loosely or otherwise to the synagogues of the Dispersion. The instructors themselves were dependent on oral tradition and only later had the written summaries, letters, collections of sayings and gospels. Nor did they possess what one could call an Apostolic College for reference to a central authority. The Jerusalem Church formed a core which gave continuity and guidance where required, as in the

case of the laying on of hands at Samaria. But their responsibility and authority weakened, instead of increasing, after the second decade of the Church's history. Even in the early days the activity of St Peter and St Paul becomes that of apostles who act first on their own initiative and conviction, bearing in mind their responsibility to God and, particularly in St Paul's case, a sense of Divine Commission. Only later, where necessary, do they justify, defend or support their action by reference to general tradition and its maintaining nucleus of leaders. There is no suggestion that they start off on their work with a theological compendium bearing the Imprimatur of an Apostolic College. It is doubtful whether people like St Paul ever began evangelization in any district with a clearly defined and elaborate corpus of doctrine to which his converts had to be brought in the manner of a modern Confirmation class. This is especially true of the early days when the converts showed an unfortunate inclination to fill up the gaps for themselves as did the Thessalonians. Later, St Paul could commend the Corinthians for holding fast to traditions committed to them, but much of his correspondence was called forth by the need for filling up the gaps in the elementary instruction. And this necessary simplicity of instruction had its dangers. It suited the shortness of time before the expected Parousia, but the delay became dangerous. The very simplicity also made possible mistaken elaboration. Its bases in the personality and authority of the Apostle founding a Church made it possible for subsequent teachers to divert the Pauline converts from their original course by depreciating the Apostle's authority and exaggerating their own support by Jerusalem. Thus the individualism and fluidity of the Apostolic method could itself lead to difficulties. And these were increased by further individualism within the churches stimulated by the mistaken estimation of the powers of the Holy Spirit and their abuse in unrestrained individual prophecy and interpretation.

At Corinth partisanship produced errors and divisions. There was interaction and reaction between groups. In the Church as a whole the same danger lurked. In the later writings of the New Testament it may be seen that these tendencies are reflected in such matters as the doctrine of the new life commencing at Baptism, misinterpreted as minimizing the need for resurrection and judgment, or the reaction against Jewish eschatological hopes, or the mistaken ideas about sacramentalism. The reaction of Gentile minds against emphasis on the human life of Jesus is another example of the way in which so many of the troubles of the first century in its later period were caused by those who carried orthodox teaching to unorthodox conclusions or reacted against what were to them unpalatable features in the primitive faith. Sometimes, as in the case of the Agape at Corinth, they might retain a pagan habit under the guise or even conviction that their intention was orthodox. More often, errors in conduct which were a reversion to type and background were justified by misinterpretation, or even deliberate perversion, of an item of the teaching of the Church or of an Apostle.

It has been maintained that much of the antinomianism of the

first century was due to the perversion of the Pauline doctrine of the Christian liberty. This would appear to be supported by the fact of the importance and duration of the Gentile-Jewish controversy and by the fact that in apparent reaction against St Paul, the Church as a whole did so definitely develop the idea of Christianity as the New Law. There are even references to those who have misinterpreted St Paul, and the Epistle of St James has been understood as a counter-blast. The Tübingen criticism was, of course, based upon this theory.

But it is more probable that the major causes of the antinomianism lay in the failure of the eschatological hope, the declining ethical standard of many of the new converts, the influence of laxity in the outside world and later in extravagant dualism. Perversion of Pauline doctrine had something to do with antinomianism but less than has been commonly supposed. As for the Gentile-Jewish controversy, in its original form, it seems to have dwindled to a conclusion much nearer to the time suggested in the Acts than some critical opinion would allow, with Romans as its swan-song. The first signs of incipient Gnosticism are very late in the first century, but the connecting link lay in the trouble-centre of the early Church—Asia Minor. Here is the new danger in the form of speculative and unorthodox Dispersion-Judaism with the strain of opposition to it running through Colossians, Hebrews, the early chapters of the Apocalypse, the Pastoral Epistles and 2 Peter and Jude, as well as the Fourth Gospel.

The effect of the failure of the eschatological hope upon the rise of heresy is as unquestionable as was its effect upon the readjustment of ideas and expressions by the New Testament writers. Even in the early days the postponement of the Parousia had led to difficulties about the future life and resurrection. The decline of belief in a Coming in Judgment diminished the restraining force of a fear of the judgment, cast doubts upon the authenticity of the tradition connected with it and even upon those who conveyed and represented the orthodox viewpoint. It readily perverted ideas of a permanently saved and "safe" state received by Baptism and made use of ideas of the unimportance of matter. But this belonged to a later stage.

But the eschatological hope did not dwindle gradually. Orthodox writers could resolve difficulties for the faithful by emphasis on the Parousia as a spiritual experience as well as a future event. But sometimes there were intervening reversions to more primitive ideas of the Coming as imminent and in Judgment. An example of this is seen in the Johannine Epistles, where a definite statement is required in view of the mischievous workings of the "Antichrists." It would appear also that the rise and fall of the eschatological hope, as well as heresies of reaction after recurring failure, are not unconnected with periods of persecution.

During the period of the New Testament the Church grew and expanded at a surprising rate. Its extension was not always accompanied by maintenance of standards. The falsity of any idea that the Church was a trouble-free body composed of perfect Christians is shown by the strain of comment which runs through the writings with such examples as the troubles of the Jerusalem Church, Romans

xvi, 17-20, Corinthians, the Pastoral Epistles, Revelation ii-iii, and elsewhere. Even allowing for the language of controversy one has to acknowledge that many of the New Testament writings are works of crisis. One can see how the Christian legalism and discipline developed in the effort to deal with ethical troubles just as the primitive creed and catechism, with the growing emphasis on Apostolic authority and later on the Canon of orthodox writings, developed to deal with doctrinal difficulties. But the intensification of the definition of the creed and catechism in the second century seem to suggest that the scrutiny, preparation and supervision of converts in their standards of ethics and faith had not been adequate in the first century. This corresponds with the increasing bitterness of denunciation in the New Testament and with the decreasing hope of the recovery of members who had gone astray.

This may appear to be a dark picture of the New Testament period. But to obtain a more complete picture one must remember that Churches making satisfactory progress would be less likely to need epistles of challenge, advice or guidance than were groups in such difficulties as those at Corinth, which needed four letters in all. Even in the case of St Paul we have the calm optimism of the main theme of Ephesians to act as a complement to the admonitions of other epistles. Only in the case of Galatians is he unable to commence by remarking on something worthy of real commendation.

Moreover, the main message of the New Testament is one of hope, expansion and victory. It is not a book of a Church defending a weak faith in a dead Messiah. It is the record of an inspired Church with a sense of the mission and responsibility entrusted to it by a living Lord.

FENTON MORLEY.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Western Church

THERE must be many people who, at one time or another, have attended the Liturgy in the Eastern Orthodox, the Roman, and the Anglican Communions. All those who have done so must have been struck with the very different feeling and atmosphere which is experienced in each of them. But the difference between the Roman and the Anglican is far less than the difference between either of them and the Liturgy of the Eastern Orthodox. About the Eastern Orthodox there is almost a generic difference. It is the purpose of this essay to suggest that the reason for this startling difference is a certain weakness in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Western Church.

The old tag "lex orandi, lex credendi" is witness enough to the close connexion at all times between the Church's Liturgy and the Church's Doctrine. These two have always been closely interwoven, and the wording of any liturgy will tell us a good deal about the belief of any Church that uses it. On the other hand, too much attention can be (and often is) paid to the actual words of a Liturgy. What is done is of equal importance with what is said, and this needs to be borne

in mind. The words of ancient Liturgies do not tell us all about them. We need to remember that they were performed, not just recited, and a certain amount of imaginative reconstruction is needed in dealing with them. But it requires little or no imagination to see how different in feeling the ancient Liturgies, both in East and West, were from the modern Roman or the Anglican Liturgy. Even the odd bits of ancient liturgies sprinkled in quotation about such popular books as *Liturgy and Worship* and *The Shape of the Liturgy* testify to a great difference in feeling and atmosphere between the ancient and the modern.

Wherein, then, lies the difference? It seems to the present writer that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has practically fallen out of the Western tradition altogether. Do not mistake me. I am not making the absurd accusation that the whole Western Church has been consciously heretical. Far from it. The Western Church has tried hard to be conscientiously orthodox, and in all her formularies has remained so. But it is one thing to have the Creeds enshrined in the words of the Creed. It is a different and far more difficult and subtle matter to live out those Creeds in the daily life of the Church, and more especially in the performance of the Liturgy. In the Western Church interest has centred most chiefly on the nature of the Eucharistic Presence. That has meant that the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement (to mention only two) have been fully kept living in the life of the Church and in the performance of the Liturgy. In particular the very close attention paid to the exposition of the doctrine of the Atonement has meant that the relationship between the Father and the Son has never been neglected in the life of the Western Church.

The same cannot be said of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps because no really great controversy has centred round the Holy Spirit since the time of the Macedonians, the doctrine itself has been too much taken for granted. The development of the Roman Canon gave no central place to the Holy Spirit, as was done in the East, and not unnaturally it became possible for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit to fall into the background. I say, it became possible, because though the doctrine of the Holy Spirit ought to be most closely connected with the Liturgy it is very hard to relate it in so many words. Miss Dorothy Sayers has truly remarked " . . . we cannot really look at the movement of the Spirit, just because It is the power by which we do the looking." It is easier to be conscious of the fellowship of the Holy Ghost in the performance of the Liturgy than it is to write or to think about it. For this very reason once the doctrine has fallen into the background it will be harder to bring into the full life of the Church again. Indeed the living doctrine (as opposed to the formula which expresses it in so many words) can only be recovered in the life of the Church. No amount of learned talk and no great books of scholarship will by themselves revive it, and make it live. The Church is the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. In our initiation into the Church we are given the gift of Him. We are only able to worship at all because we live in Him. Therefore it ought to be that in those combined and corporate acts that are designed for the whole Church we find

the Holy Spirit. In short, it is in the Church assembled for worship that we should find the living doctrine of the Holy Spirit. His work ought to be most obvious and easy to find in the performance of the Liturgy, even though it may not be easy to define it or describe it exactly.

But in the Western Church of to-day this does not seem to be so. The Christian doctrine of God is Trinitarian in all our formularies. But our worship does not seem to be fully Trinitarian in action. Ask the average fairly well instructed person in either the Roman or Anglican Communions what part the Holy Spirit plays in our worship and you will, as a rule, not get much of an answer. A far more satisfactory answer is likely to be forthcoming if the question is about the Father or our Lord or (in the case of Romans and some Anglicans) the Blessed Virgin. They could perhaps all tell you something about the Holy Spirit, but it would not in all probability be something which lay close to the centre of their own religious experience. The tendency is to be Trinitarian in theory and Binitarian in practice. The Holy Spirit tends to get left out or to be dismissed with a rather airy "Of course, we assume that," which does nothing about translating belief into action. Nevertheless, the Holy Spirit is the bond of Unity, and wherever worship is not fully Trinitarian in the sense that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is being lived out in the worship of the Church, there will always be the danger that such worship will become narrowly sectarian and disruptive because it lacks the full and essential unity, which is the pattern unity of God Himself. If worship shows a tendency to be Binitarian, it will not be a worship that can satisfy all men, and is likely for this very reason to be the cause of division among Christians.

It is arguable that this is what has happened in the history of the Western Church. At times there may have been failures in other directions, but it is mainly in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit that the failure has been most seriously felt. The decline seems to have begun in the Dark Ages, during which the part of the people in the Liturgy became more and more passive and the sense of the lay people being the "offerers" was lost almost completely. It is certain that a real grasp of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the Bond of Unity at the time of the Great Schism in the eleventh century would have made that schism unthinkable. Even by that time it was the Pope (and to a lesser extent the Patriarch) who were thought of as the bond of unity. In the West the idea of the Papacy rather than of the Holy Spirit as the cement of the Church grew inevitably as the Headship of the Church was thought of rather in terms of the Holy Roman Empire than in the terms of the New Testament. How this idea grew is a matter of history, as is the increasing resistance to it which in the end culminated in the splitting up of the Western Church at the Reformation.

It is significant that the Reformation was very largely concerned with the reform of worship. Plainly there was something in the worship of the Church which was most unsatisfactory. How unsatisfactory it was the very decrees of the Council of Trent tell us, as well as the

spate of new (and usually bad) Liturgies which flooded Europe at the time. There can be no doubt when all allowances have been made for political jobbing that dissatisfaction with the worship of the Church was both widespread and sincere. All the Reformers in their different ways seem to have been attempting to restore the "*communis sensus*" of the living Christian community. It appears plainly in the teaching of both Calvin and Luther. That their aim did not succeed, and that in the end they succeeded almost in destroying what they set out to create does not alter the fact of their aim. They failed to achieve their aim because they failed to revive in the Church the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. They attacked the symptoms rather than the source of the disease. Nor can they be blamed for this very greatly. They were all the children of the Schoolmen theologically, and in their writings and discussions just sufficient attention was paid to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit to ensure orthodoxy. He was found a place in the medieval system, but there was no idea that He should control it silently and from within. That would have been too upsetting to the legalist atmosphere of the age.

Chiefly because it was clean contrary to the spirit of the age, the Reformers generally speaking did not turn towards a revival of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. They groped rather uncertainly. They tried every means of external organization. They wrote liturgies. They were at great pains to re-think the theology of the Church. But they never came near to reviving the great doctrine of the Holy Spirit. That they failed so completely is partly due to the incoming of the purely individualistic thought of the Renaissance. The new learning laid great emphasis on the importance of the individual. Salvation came to be seen more and more as an individual and not as a corporate thing. So they applied the old principles very largely to the new situation, and Protestantism was born as the application of medieval thought to the individual rather than to the community. Four centuries have shown the disruptive power of this change. The medieval Church had at least tried to substitute something else for the lack of the living doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Most of the Protestant bodies did not find anything else to compensate and even the strict discipline of John Calvin has been less successful as a uniting force than the Papacy. But it is frequently obvious that the Reformers were vaguely conscious of the fact that their efforts were not enough. Their constant striving after Church Orders and Disciplines shows an awareness that something more was wanted. They felt deeply the need of a sense of community and brotherhood among Christians. The general desire to "turn the Mass into a Communion" bears witness to the longing to make the Christian community real. But the Holy Spirit remained almost unknown except by Name.

It was much the same with the Roman Church at the Council of Trent. There also the substitutes for the Holy Spirit which had grown up in medieval times were preferred to the revival of the doctrine itself, though it was, perhaps, a question of ignorance rather than of preference. It is worth while looking at those things which in the Roman Church took the place of the Holy Spirit because that Church

is such a compact body that these things show rather more obviously there than anywhere else, at least so it seems to me. The Holy Spirit is the great Bond of Unity in the Church. No Church worthy of the name can do without some attempt at unity, so that where the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has fallen into the background other things must be found to take His place. Consider some of the faults usually alleged against the Roman Church in this light. What might be called the un-Catholic part of the Roman body of doctrine (and by this I mean those parts of the Roman doctrine which are protested against by both Anglicans and Orthodox as well as Protestant bodies) nearly all seem to be attempts to find substitutes for the living doctrine of the Holy Spirit. First and foremost there are the Papal claims, and those which are protested against can be summed up roughly as "all those claims which exceed the claim to be a central court of appeal." The Papal claims which exceed that are really attempts to unify the Church by using what may be described as police methods. The doctrine of the Papal Infallibility is the crown of such attempts at unity. It smacks more of the councils of Empire than of the Council of Jerusalem. It depends in the last resort upon external authority rather than on the inward compulsion of the Holy Spirit. There seems to be in the post-Reformation idea of the Papacy a lack of faith in the power of the Holy Spirit, and overmuch fearfulness of the power of wayward bishops and teachers. The authority of the Papacy is that of the Roman Emperor rather than that of the Apostles, as shown in the New Testament and the early Church. In the post-Reformation development of the Papacy the Society of Jesus played a large part. The formative book of the society, the *Spiritual Exercises* of St Ignatius, contain virtually no reference to the Holy Spirit. If the Society of Jesus had been able to make subjection to the Holy Spirit take the place of subjection to the Papacy the Counter-Reformation might have gained even more ground and reunited instead of further dividing the Western Church, and the word jesuitical might not have had its present flavour.

The *Spiritual Exercises* will serve as an illustration of the next point. One is led at times to suspect that our Lady is the Third Person of the Holy Trinity in that book, and practical experience suggests that this undeniably great work receives much illumination if colloquies are made with the Holy Spirit in the places where the Blessed Virgin is indicated by St Ignatius. In short, the Roman Church has used the cultus of our Lady in place of the Holy Spirit. If the Papacy has taken the Unifying power of the Holy Spirit, our Lady has been given many of His powers of Guidance, and her place as mother has also been used to invigorate the family feeling of the Church, where again the Holy Spirit should have the primacy. This has led to such absurdities in the popular cultus as the remark quite frequently heard from devout Romans "Our Lord couldn't refuse His Blessed Mother anything," with the naive assumption that our Lady is really more powerful than our Lord. In a popular Roman Missal published for the laity I counted five times as many references to the Blessed Virgin as to the Holy Spirit. In the Rosary the Holy

Spirit has one of the five Glorious Mysteries and the Blessed Virgin two. In the Roman version of the Divine Praises there is no reference to the Holy Spirit and much to the Blessed Virgin, and such examples could be multiplied.

A third way in which the Roman Church seems to have tried to supply the deficiency in the real and living doctrine of the Holy Spirit is undoubtedly in the cult that has grown up round the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. It is most significant that this really began to come to the fore towards the end of the Dark Ages and developed more strongly as the sense of the living action of the Holy Spirit in the Church became weaker. It is even more significant that the cult has never found a place in the Orthodox Churches of the East. Here again is a function of the Holy Spirit, to make living in the Church the presence of the Risen Lord. This has been transferred to the Sacrament. His presence has been isolated in it, and everything has been focussed on it. Again the "popular" (though never official) result is that our Lord is often considered as being absent elsewhere by comparison with His Presence at Exposition and Benediction. Here also, a recovery of the living doctrine of the Holy Spirit would help to restore a true balance again between the divided Churches. Finally and most significantly of all there is the refusal of the Roman Church to reject publicly and for ever the use of persecution as a weapon of the Christian religion; for the Holy Spirit will not coerce presumably any more than our Lord would in His Incarnate Life on earth. These, then, are the main things which point to a loss of grasp on the living doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Roman Church.

Because of the close organization of the Roman Church, the lack is more easily seen in her. But that does not mean that Anglicans and others are by any means blameless. At the Reformation there was, as has been pointed out above, a failure by the Reformers to recover the doctrine of the Holy Spirit to its rightful place. In the Church of England it was made easier to recover by the very fact of the Prayer Book. It is fashionable to deride the Prayer Book in many quarters, but it has one tremendous merit which is not nearly sufficiently recognized, that with all its defects it does make the whole Christian people active in the offering of the Liturgy and thus opens up the way to recovering the full doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The Prayer Book at least can provide the right sort of soil in which that doctrine can grow and recover, in a way that the complications of the Latin Mass never can. The appalling defect of the so-called "English Missal" (which is Latin in all but language!) is that is makes the Mass once again a matter for experts and the educated and not for agricultural labourers. But the Church of England as a whole, in spite of the advantage of having a liturgy in which the people can once again be "offerers," has not often grasped its great advantages and the recovery of the living fellowship of the Holy Spirit has been spasmodic and local rather than deliberate and continuous. And where it has been recovered it has been done unconsciously rather than because the Holy Spirit has Himself been sought.

Perhaps the only time when the revival of the doctrine was actively and deliberately made was in the seventeenth century, when the Caroline divines made real progress towards the regaining of it. But at the Revolution the non-Juring schism put a stop to it though the Liturgy of the non-Jurors shows what progress they made towards rediscovery of the importance of the Holy Spirit in worship. The eighteenth century has little to show, though both Methodism and the Evangelical movement largely gained their strength through the feeling after unity in the Spirit. The Oxford Movement, on the other hand, in the next century went all out for the reviving of the true doctrine of the Church, and this again made ready for a return of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit just because the doctrines of the Holy Spirit and the Church are necessarily very closely linked. In this century, however, that preparation has not really been followed up because a large wing of the Catholic Revival has tended to imitate the Counter-Reformation and its individualism, and there has been a positive phobia of the Epiclesis which the 1928 Book rather unwisely tried to make a part of the Consecration. But the result has been to throw out the baby with the bath water, and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been driven again into the background. (This has been further helped, as I see it, by the great influence of Dom Gregory Dix who, in spite of his really great work, seems to suffer from a tendency always to end up at the Roman Canon of the Mass wherever he may begin from.) To some extent the movement towards the Parish Communion has led to the possibility of the recovery of the living doctrine of the Holy Spirit fairly widely in the Church, but such a recovery will not automatically follow the introduction of the Parish Communion, which can very easily degenerate into the "same old thing plus music" and the Communion of the people at a less sacrificial hour. Deliberate and persistent efforts need to be made to create the real "fellowship of the Holy Spirit" in our parishes. It will take much patience and much teaching because there are literally centuries of neglect to be overcome, and individualism is bred in the bone of the average Englishman.

Of other Churches a little should be said. The Friends are perhaps the sect which has done most to revive the doctrine of the Holy Spirit most deliberately, but they appear to have done it by taking Spirit as being opposed to matter rather than working through it. They have a high and living doctrine of the Holy Spirit, but it has been achieved at cost of the doctrine of the Incarnation and, to some extent, of the Atonement. Methodism, on the other hand, seems always to have been feeling after the doctrine of Holy Spirit without ever quite being able to express it exactly. The Methodist Classes of the eighteenth century and the Sacramental Fellowship of this century both have felt after an expression of the fellowship of the Holy Spirit in action, but again with them our Lord has usually been preached not only as a personal but as an individualistic Saviour, and in the nineteenth century Methodism showed very grave disunion. Presbyterians too have been at a disadvantage, because the insistence that the congregation shall be very largely dumb has done much to

hinder the right sort of atmosphere in which the living doctrine of the Holy Spirit can live and develop.

Finally, what is this atmosphere which can help us regain the living doctrine of the Holy Spirit? It is hard to say just because it is so lacking. But tentatively I would say that there were six necessary conditions at least for the recovery of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as a living thing among us. First the conscious and repeated recognition of our membership of the Church as being in the fellowship of Holy Spirit. Secondly, an awareness that we can only worship at all because we are in that fellowship. (All other worship is subtly Pelagian. Unless this is clearly recognized the Offertory at the Parish Communion can become thoroughly Pelagian.) Thirdly, there must be a strong sense that salvation is corporate as well as individual, is in fact primarily corporate. Fourthly, it is necessary that all should have active participation in the Liturgy, which alone can express properly both the diversity of gifts and the unity of the Holy Spirit. Fifthly, there should be invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Liturgy sufficiently marked to make it abundantly clear that the "glory is equal and the majesty co-eternal" in the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Lastly and not least important it is necessary that there should be a real sense that the Church is a working community concerned with all life because the Holy Spirit is "the Lord, the Giver of Life."

An article such as this plainly suffers from over-generalization because it is a subject for a large book rather than an article. But when allowances have been made for that I hope that it will still remain clear that we in the West do most urgently need to make living again, in the worship and life of the Church, that doctrine of the Holy Spirit which, though we have it in all our formularies, is not really a living and burning thing amongst us. There will be no real revival of the Christian religion in the West until the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is recovered to make us a real Community. It begins to appear that the Orthodox Church in Russia is outshining the Communist community by its possession of this living doctrine. The world of the West also needs to see the Holy Spirit living in the Church. We who are Anglicans have as our possessions all those things which can help us to realize this. We are not constrained by the Papacy. We have a Liturgy which, though it needs improvement, can be understood and used by all who share it. We have every opportunity at this time of recovering the true doctrine of the Holy Spirit because never, perhaps, since the time of Constantine have there been so few merely formal Christians regularly coming to Church. But let us beware of thinking of the preaching of the Holy Spirit as a panacea. We need to recover that but not to lose any other great doctrine. "The Catholic faith is this—that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity."

PHILIP PARE.

Martin Buber

Readers of Theology will no doubt wish to join his many friends throughout the world in congratulating Martin Buber on reaching his seventieth anniversary. His fiftieth birthday was marked by the publication of a Festschrift, and another such volume had been contemplated for this occasion, but had to be abandoned owing to understandable difficulties confronting the would-be contributors, most of whom are now living in Palestine. But in view of contacts made during his visit to England last year and through the increasing number of his works now appearing in English translations, a brief personal appreciation of this significant contemporary personality may be welcomed. There are others better able to assess Buber's importance in specialized spheres and his influence on more than one generation, but perhaps one who has been privileged during the past three years to spend a quite considerable amount of time in regular discussion with him may be permitted to offer this small tribute to a great teacher.

The name of Martin Buber has long been one to conjure with in European religious and philosophical circles. More recently, through the English translation of his *Ich und Du* (1937) and the widespread use made of his fundamental teachings in current literature, his name has become familiar to most English-speaking readers and students of philosophy and religion. But it is not always realized by this latter section of his public that Buber's chief impact and influence has been upon the Jewish community, from which he is sprung and of which he is a member.

He was born in 1878 in Vienna, but as he himself tells us in his *Weg zum Chassidismus*, his early, formative years were spent in Galicia. Here at Lemberg he lived in the house of his grandfather, Solomon Buber, who was not only an influential and successful business man, but also a well-trained and deeply religious Jew. The debt Martin Buber owes to his grandfather is indicated by the dedication to him of the grandson's first Hebrew book, an English translation of which (*The Prophetic Faith*) is to be published this year. It was here that Martin Buber passed through the first stages in his Jewish education, was imbued with a knowledge and love of the Hebrew Bible, and came into living contact with the lore of Hasidism, of which he has become so notable an exponent.

Later he attended the Universities of Vienna, Berlin, Leipzig and Zürich. From 1923 to 1933 he was Professor of the Science of Religion at the University of Frankfurt-am-Main, and from 1934 the leading figure of the Jüdisches Lehrhaus in the same place. During the latter part of this period, in collaboration with Franz Rosenzweig, Buber produced an original German version of the Hebrew Scriptures with a companion volume (*Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung*) explaining the methods and principles governing what was in many senses a revolutionary translation. In whatever language his writing appears, and German is his first tongue, Buber is not easy to understand, this being a deliberate policy, often (as in the case of some other

modern writers) misunderstood. Regarding much of modern speech as corrupted by careless and frequent use, he prefers to avoid the ordinary and familiar word or phrase, and chooses instead what at first sight may seem clumsy and tiresomely obscure, but what in fact is painstakingly selected, and designed by its very unfamiliarity to startle the reader into extraordinary alertness and attention. This careful scrutiny of language is bestowed not only upon his original work, whether German or Hebrew, but is extended to translations as well. He is by no means content to hand over the controls completely to the translator, but likes to subject the translation to the fullest possible discussion, exercising the utmost deliberation over every word and sentence.

This will suggest the amazing industry of the man. In recent years since his arrival in Palestine he has had no secretary, and yet he has himself personally supervised the preparation of many books for the press, in many languages and on many subjects. In some cases he has himself undertaken even such detailed labour as the making of indices to his books. He is a recognized authority on Hasidism, and last year saw the publication, in Hebrew and English editions, of his collection of Hasidic tales, many of which had never before appeared in print. He must always have been a prolific and systematic reader, as the quotations and references in his writings show. His knowledge of different religious systems of thought, Eastern as well as Western, is such that not only is he able to make indirect use of the vast amount of material at his disposal, but he has at least one small volume to his credit, in which he has translated Chinese love stories into German, showing that wherever possible he has himself gone to the source. In addition to all this he has continued his teaching duties, having been Professor of Social Philosophy at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, since 1937. And he is always ready to give of his time to those who are genuinely anxious to speak with him, for it is in personal contacts, in the honest searching after the truth between man and man, and between man and God, that he sees the most urgent task of life.

Here we are brought to Buber's stand in regard to everyday affairs, and particularly to politics, for although he is frequently tempted to despair of politicians, he is realist enough to admit that there must be an ordering of man's relationships in community, and it is for men of the Spirit to make their contribution towards the realization of the right ordering of society. So for nearly fifty years Buber has been an active supporter of Zionism, although his interpretation of that movement is fundamentally spiritual. Many Jews in Palestine now claim to have been attracted thither by Buber's words. For many years he edited the official Zionist weekly, *Die Welt*, and later founded and edited *Der Jude*, once the leading periodical of German-speaking Jews. In Palestine he has been a member since its inception in 1942 of the *Ihud* (Union) group, associated with the name of Dr Magnes, President of the Hebrew University, and has been responsible for publishing the monthly Hebrew journal of this group. The particular aim of this group, as is well known from their evidence submitted

to the last two Palestine Inquiry Commissions, is Arab-Jewish co-operation in a bi-national State. Buber and his friends have always seen this to be an absolute necessity for any lasting solution of the Palestine problem, and it has been a growing grief to them to see the way in which their warnings have been overlooked by their fellow Jews, and their overtures to so large an extent rejected by the Arabs and branded as utopian by others.

"For decades," one of his friends wrote recently (Ernst Simon, *Martin Buber's Weg zwischen Gedanke und Tat*, Yedioth, Tel Aviv, 1948), "Buber has been the chief representative of Judaism to the Christian world, the ambassador of Israel to the nations, albeit an ambassador not always accredited by his own people." At the same time he has a deep understanding of Christianity, based upon an acquaintance with Christian literature of all ages right back to the Greek New Testament itself (see THEOLOGY, XLIX, 239 *ff.*) and upon many intimate links with Christians in all parts of the world. So he is peculiarly fitted to contribute towards the improvement of Christian-Jewish relationships, a cause very near to his heart.

Such a man, with so many interests and so many contacts, is bound to have his critics as well as his disciples. Such a man cannot be ignored, and if he does not stimulate a sympathetic response, he will probably be treated with scorn or even open opposition. (The writer could give many instances of such criticism—as he could also of parallel approbation—from amongst the scholars, intellectuals and ordinary working folk of Palestine Jewry today. Readers of THEOLOGY may recall Fr Martin Jarrett-Kerr's article "Real Life is Being" in Vol. XLVII, pp. 154 *ff.*) Certainly such a man can only be rightly adjudged from the viewpoint of later generations, and so it is perhaps hazardous for friend or foe to attempt to pass judgment now. Before the writer came to Palestine he was told by an oriental Christian living in Britain that he would find the most powerful spiritual figure at present in the Holy Land in Martin Buber. Although Buber would be the last to claim such a distinction, the writer can testify to the stimulating experience of his friendship and to the inspiring character of his personality.

C. WITTON-DAVIES.

A New Translation of the Bible

THE initiative in the plan for a new translation probably came from justifiable commercial enterprise on the part of the University Presses, who saw the sales of the Authorized and Revised Versions falling and concluded that the competition of newer versions was to some extent responsible. The great merits of Mgr Knox's translation showed that the task was not beyond the capacity of present-day scholars. The Convocations, invited to co-operate, could hardly refuse. The difficulties of the project are considerable, and it will be surprising if it can be completed in five years. To begin with the text to be translated (Mgr Knox has the comparatively simple task of translating the Vulgate).

The Apocrypha in some ways is the easiest part, for no one will have any sentiment about the Latin translation of a Greek translation of a Hebrew original, on which our 2 Esdras is based, to give an obvious example. The book of Tobit will probably be translated from the substantially longer text given by Codex Sinaiticus; Ecclesiasticus will indeed be a puzzle. R.V., going back to the earliest Greek MSS, is shorter than A.V., which uses a text thought to have been revised in the interests of the Pharisees. But since the R.V. was published some two-thirds of the Hebrew original has been discovered. Shall the new translation use this so far as it is available, or only when necessary to make sense of the Greek? In any case, has not the Syriac text, a version of the Hebrew, equal claims with the Greek, unless we say that for the Apocrypha the Septuagint is the official Church book?

Coming to the Old Testament, we meet the textual problem in an acute form. The dilemma is familiar. Which is better—the official Hebrew text (Massoretic), of which there are no MSS, other than scraps, older than the ninth century of our era, or the Greek version made from about 300 to 100 B.C., the oldest complete MSS of which are some 500 years earlier than the corresponding Hebrew ones? The former is an eclectic text, MSS deviating from the adopted standard having been destroyed, so that we are dependent on the judgment of the Rabbis in the early Christian centuries. If the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch, dating from *c.* 300 B.C., can be reconstructed from the LXX, should it not be preferred? But the LXX text itself is a bewildering problem, nowhere near solution. Swete's text follows the main MS., varying through the work, and Rahlfs' text, which tries to establish the original on critical lines, cannot be taken as universally acceptable. The view towards which specialists are moving is that the LXX was never meant to be an exact translation, but rather a kind of Targum, or interpretation, hence the demand for a literal version which Aquila supplied. Also, the historic Old Testament of the non-Roman Western Church, as regards both Canon and text, is that taken over from the Jews. So probably future revisers will be conservative and retain the Massoretic text whenever possible. But what are they to do when the M.T. makes nonsense, the LXX sense? Especially in 1 Samuel and 1 Kings the LXX greatly improves our comprehension of the meaning, but may not the Alexandrian Jews have been faced with the same problems as we and have felt free to use drastic methods of solving them? Yet another complicating factor is that for the New Testament writers the LXX *was* the Old Testament, with but few exceptions. Is the Christian Church justified in rejecting their Bible in favour of that of the later Rabbis?

The text of the New Testament is an even harder problem because it affects us more deeply. The suspicion felt by many that the primitive text of Westcott and Hort, based largely on the agreement of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, was after all a scholarly revision undertaken by men with the same type of mind as Westcott and Hort (who naturally preferred it) is beginning to harden into a certainty, as the material

now being recovered pushes the origin of the Western Text into an even earlier period. But when we are tempted to believe it primitive we are confronted with Codex Bezæ, the extreme example of it, whose originality none would care to affirm. It will probably be agreed that the Western text as a whole is the best representative of the text of the second century, when much freedom in adding, omitting, and paraphrasing was permissible. Revision was inevitable. If so, can we hope to improve on that presumed to have been undertaken by the great Alexandrians of the third century? I pass over the emergence of the Cæsarean text since the revisers' time, for the sake of brevity.

The second great problem is, are we to translate the original at all costs, faithfully representing its occasional incoherences, or to make sense, on the principle that Prophets and Apostles did not write nonsense and, if we make them do so, we are not being faithful reproducers of their thought? The trouble about the latter course is that we are liable to make them say what we think they ought to have said and to produce a commentary rather than a translation. A reference to some pages of Dr Moffatt's great translation of the Bible, especially the Prophets, shows that he makes sense (sometimes he has to give up) often by drastic rearrangements, emendations, etc. Is emendation to be allowed? Remember how many of the confident emendations of thirty years ago are now given up. The work of Dr S. R. Driver in establishing new meanings of Hebrew words from Assyrian and other cognate languages sometimes makes emendation unnecessary. But is this new tool sufficiently tried to be trusted?

An example of the problem in the New Testament occurs in Ephesians i. St Paul dictates the chapter in the style of an extempore prayer. One thought leads to another; sentences are left unfinished, main verbs are omitted, and the whole chapter is one long sentence. R.V. faithfully reproduces the original. Modern versions break up the whole into short sentences, as St Paul ought to have done. Which is right?

The following may be mentioned among the many points which suggest themselves.

(*a*) "You" is to replace "thou" for the second person singular, except in prayers. Admirable in most cases, but what about Luke xxii, 31, 32? "Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat, but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not, etc." "You" cannot be used throughout unless a footnote is added.

(*b*) The Revisers did their best to use the same English word for each Greek word, with the result that they were accused of pedantry. But when you depart from this rule you expose yourself to the danger of subjectivity.

(*c*) What allowance should be made for the Semitic background of the Gospels? Is our version to be influenced by our conviction that the tradition must have passed through an Aramaic phase, oral or written? In a case like Mark i, 8, "I baptized you with water," certainly. The Greek aorist represents the timeless Semitic "tense" and "I baptize" is right. "My baptism is with water" is the meaning.

Lastly, are we to try to keep the numinous values of the A.V.? These have a wide appeal. Listen to H. L. Mencken in *Selected Prejudices*: " . . . the best poetry that the world has so far produced, to wit, in the Jewish Scriptures. . . . It is probably chiefly responsible for the survival of Christianity" (p. 27). "It is not the logical substance of the Old Testament that continues to hold the mind of modern man . . . it is the sonorous strophes of the ancient bards and prophets. And it is not the epistemology, or the natural history, or the ethical scheme, or the system of jurisprudence of the New Testament that melts his heart and wets his eyes; it is simply the poetical magic of the Sermon on the Mount, the exquisite parables, and the incomparable story of the Child in the Manger" (p. 99). Now I do not believe that music and poetry convert anyone. But they do keep the windows of heaven open. The appeal of seventeenth-century diction to the intellectuals must be weighed in the balance against the insensibility of the common man to its charm, and that it should be sacrificed is not a foregone conclusion. Our Lord read the Hebrew lesson in the synagogue of Nazareth, and then presumably read the Aramaic Targum, and then preached on the text. Is this the true model for us?

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Oliver Tomkins is Assistant General Secretary of the World Council of Churches.

The Rev. Fenton Morley, B.D., is Lecturer in Hebrew at Cuddesdon College.

The Rev. Philip Pare is Vicar of Cheshunt.

The Rev. C. Witton-Davies is a Canon of St George's Cathedral, Jerusalem.

Dr Lowther Clarke is a Residentiary Canon of Chichester Cathedral.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Acts of the Apostles. By Wilfred L. Knox. Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.

This is a small book of first importance. It consists of five lectures given by Dr Knox at the Vacation School of Biblical Study at Oxford in August, 1946, on such fascinating themes as the author and sources of Acts, its historical and theological importance, and the question of Galatians and the Council of Jerusalem. A scholarly appendix on the differences of language in Luke and Acts follows. By a happy combination of technical discussion and popular treatment in the best sense of the word Dr Knox has succeeded in writing one of those volumes in which the expert and the general reader alike can find instruction and profit. Many balanced judgments on disreputed questions are given, the general tendency of the whole being in the

direction of affirming the genuineness and historical worth of the Acts.

In the opening lecture Dr Knox meets Professor A. C. Clark's challenge of the Lukan authorship in his *Acts of the Apostles* (1933), and after detailed examination of the linguistic data claims that Clark's researches "tend to prove that the same hand is responsible for the final composition both of the Acts and the Gospel" (p. 14). In discussing the sources Dr Knox inclines to agree with Professor Torrey rather than with Harnack and the editors of the *Beginnings of Christianity*. He doubts whether, apart from the speeches, Luke used any written sources, with the possible exception of chapters i to v, inclusive. Luke collected his material from oral sources, "often taking down his informant's words verbatim," but it is just possible that he had a document describing the missionary journey of Peter which ended with the conversion of Cornelius (p. 39). On the question of the Council of Jerusalem in Acts xv, Dr Knox agrees with those scholars who hold that Galatians was written earlier. During the Famine Visit (Acts xi), Peter, James and John agreed to leave Paul a free hand in preaching to the Gentiles. Later at Antioch Peter wavered, and the Council followed, and the result of the circular letter was a final settlement of the controversy (p. 51). Many readers, with good reason, will continue to think that this is too easy a solution of an admittedly complicated problem, and to hold that Galatians ii and Acts xv describe the same conference from different standpoints, and that the Decree represents a later decision which is recorded too early; but Dr Knox's discussion compels us to think again.

The most interesting lectures are the last two. It is refreshing to read the views of a thoroughly critical scholar who sees no reason to doubt Luke's accuracy within the limits which he set himself. "By the standards of his age he has given a fresh and interesting account of the vital part of Paul's missionary career, which has preserved on the whole an accurate account of the development of Christianity" (p. 61). Doubtless legendary accretion has been at work and it would be strange if it were not so. The value of the writing is also limited by the absence of dates, preference for dramatic incidents, and carelessness in compiling sources. "Within these limitations he appears to be a truthful recorder of the facts available to him" (p. 68).

A careful and discriminating account is given of the theology of Acts. Luke's emphasis on Isa. liii, Dr Knox holds, entitles us to suppose that he has preserved a picture which is generally reliable (p. 73). Notably he has no Wisdom-Logos theology, as in Paul, but the Christology of the speech at Athens is "dramatically appropriate and thoroughly Pauline" (p. 74 *f.*). In its bearing on the problem of the Son of Man Christology, Dr Knox suggests that in Stephen's last words Luke may have preserved intact a Christology which was current in the early Church for some time after the Resurrection, though it has disappeared from the rest of the New Testament outside the Gospels. No attempt is made in the Acts to modify the sources in conformity with the later developments of Pauline theology,

and there is special interest in the terms applied to Jesus in iii, 15 and v, 31, in the description "Servant" and the rare use of the name "Saviour." The doctrine of the Spirit is also primitive, and if Luke has not given us information about current perversions of the Gospel, it is reasonable to suppose that at the time he did not realize how serious their influence was to be. "Even the greatest of historians cannot be criticized for failing to foresee the future."

From this review it will be seen, I hope, how stimulating and suggestive these lectures are.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

WESLEY COLLEGE, HEADINGLEY.

TWO HEBREW PROPHETS. By H. Wheeler Robinson. Lutterworth Press. 6s.

THE HEBREW PROPHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS. By Harold Knight. Lutterworth Press. 10s. 6d.

These two books raise theological issues of fundamental importance and they speak with one voice. It is that of the late Principal Wheeler Robinson, to whom Dr Knight justly acknowledges his great debt. The common ground between them is a most impressive witness to the permanent value of the Hebrew *thought-forms* by which the Old Testament revelation was mediated, as well as to the inadequacy of much in "classical" Christian theology.

Like Canon Kennett in his Schweich Lectures for 1931, both writers are acutely aware of the unavoidable limitations of human language and of the need for what they agree to call "the higher anthropomorphism" (R., pp. 21-24; K., pp. 136, 144 and 146). Together they reject the doctrine of the impassibility of God (R., p. 22 *f.*; K., p. 141) and maintain that the prophets' presentation of the divine pathos offers the most fruitful approach to the Christian's understanding of the Incarnation and Atonement (R., p. 21 *f.*; K., p. 148-9). Master and pupil alike affirm that the authority of prophetic revelation implies an essential kinship between man and his Creator (R., p. 44; K., p. 121 *f.*). Revelation is found to be centred in living moral communion with God ("the council of Yahweh") where "all is human, and all is divine" (R., p. 19; K., p. 124), and what Dr Knight finely calls the "massive perception of the centrality of ethics in religion" is never forgotten. All this is most heartening. It lifts us out of the moral slough into which (according to Dr Clement Webb) we have been catapulted by the revolt from theological liberalism. Nevertheless, two doubts arise. First, is there not a danger that in the first flush of enthusiasm thought-forms which belong to primitive man rather than to Hebrew prophecy will be foisted upon us as full-dress theological categories? Claims made for the importance of the "symbolic actions" of the prophets, for example, need stating very carefully. After all, Semitic magic is not obviously an improvement on Greek rationalism. Secondly, the displacement of metaphysics by metaphor raises issues which few biblical "theologians" can handle. It is no exaggeration to say that the future of theology proper may depend on whether

our philosophers can articulate in new metaphysical categories what appears to be essentially the *poetry* of biblical revelation. Dr Knight's concluding four pages on a Hebrew-Christian metaphysic state the problem without answering it.

The individual merits of the two books in front of us may be mentioned briefly. Dr Robinson's work is an exposition of Hosea and Ezekiel in a semi-popular style. The first study on Hosea is supremely successful. In fifty pages he manages to cover nearly all the main literary and religious topics with a grace and suggestiveness as welcome as they are rare.

The second study on "The Visions of Ezekiel" is much more the work of the professional student. He reviews a number of recent theories about the composition of the book and finally follows Bertholet in assuming that the oracles were delivered in Judah and Babylon by one and the same prophet. The sections on Ezekiel's religious significance repeatedly betray their author's lack of sympathy, and add so little to what is presented fully in his magnificent *Inspiration and Revelation* that at least one reader wishes his friends had followed Dr Robinson's own wish and simply published the first study as "The Cross of Hosea."

The most arresting part of Dr Knight's book has already been reviewed. There remain his chapters on the genesis of prophecy and the nature of prophetic inspiration. What he says about the uniqueness of the canonical prophets seems so convincing that his attempts to relate their work to divination, magic and ecstasy inevitably appear correspondingly strained. Most of the trouble arises from his having mingled arguments based on a reconstruction of Hebrew psychology (after the manner of Pedersen and Robinson) with arguments related (sometimes very tenuously) to textual evidence for chronological development. His presentation does a sort of scissor movement. In the early period ecstasy is rejected, largely on theoretical grounds, as cultic and Canaanite, while divination is said to hold the germ of the true prophetic development. In the seventh century, however, it is something suspiciously akin to the cultic practice of divination which is rejected as Canaanite and ecstasy which is related to genuine prophetic inspiration. This is a crudification of Dr Knight's thesis, but his twofold definition of ecstasy and his extremely confident interpretation of our slender evidence for the ministry of Elisha hardly succeed in establishing it more securely. If the presentation does not always seem to hang together as a united whole, there are many sections which in isolation command one's admiration and enthusiastic assent. The final impression is undoubtedly the right one—that the true prophet was really independent of the "mere mechanism" which associated him with other prophetic figures.

E. W. Heaton.

Gonville and Caius College,
Cambridge.

THE COMING GREAT CHURCH. By Theodore O. Wedel. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

Visitors to U.S.A. are commonly shocked by the hideous sectarianism of religion in that country, though their horror may reflect an uneasiness lest the real state of things in our own land is no better. Not the least value of Dr Wedel's book is his fidelity in describing the hideous side of what he knows—the narrowness of little Bethel, the trivial preoccupations of some Anglo-Catholics, the ability of Rome to seem to be a sort of paganism. But he knows also the goodness to be found in each tradition, and he makes some shrewd judgments about what Catholic and Protestant can learn from one another, even in those things where each is most sure that the other is defective. He approaches the problem of unity from a biblical conception of the Church as the Israel of God, and his exposition of the conception in chapter ii contains admirable passages. He tells us that F. D. Maurice is "probably the greatest theologian on the doctrine of the Church which Anglicanism has produced" (p. 94). All this arouses the expectation of the reader, but the result seems to me, both in analysis and in synthesis, grievously disappointing.

On the one side Dr Wedel describes Catholicism, with its sense of "the Great Church" realized in continuity of order, in liturgy and sacrament. But too often, through the lack of participation by the laity and of genuine fellowship and congregational worship in the local ecclesia, it misses a large part of the meaning of churchmanship. Too often, also, it tends to divinize the institution and neglect the Gospel of God, under whose judgment the institution stands. On the other side Protestantism often exhibits the true churchliness of the local ecclesia, and holds the secret of the doctrine of the Church by its touch with the theology of the Bible, but is prevented from witnessing to more than "the little Church" by its failure to see the importance of Church order and liturgy. The ecumenical movement is feeling its way towards a rediscovery of "the Great Church," but will not recover it unless it is more ready to come to terms with "the challenge of historic Catholicism." But on the other hand historic Catholicism, whose contribution to the Church of the future is badly needed, will not be heard unless it modifies its doctrine of apostolic succession in a sense which Protestants can accept. This means that episcopacy must be commended to all, but the equality of all existing ministries must first be accepted by those who possess episcopacy. Meanwhile Anglicanism, in virtue of its mediating position, can help forward reconciliation by spreading its own characteristic ethos.

I hope this is not an unfair summary of Dr Wedel's thesis. My criticisms are these:

1. I think the analysis of the "Protestant-Catholic chasm" in the sixteenth century is superficial. Dr Wedel says that the Catholics stood for an institutionalism in which Church order and sacramental life were distorted by neglect of the Gospel, and that the Protestants had the Gospel and the Scriptures wholly on their side, and needed Church order and sacramental life to be added in complement. This is on insufficient diagnosis. He never attempts to lay bare the

conflicts about grace, nature, the depravity of men, the relation of God and the world—conflicts which cut across the interpretation of the Bible and lie beneath some stubborn differences in the whole ethos of Christian belief and life. With this failure there goes also a failure to see that both Catholics and Protestants were using distorted presuppositions, and as a result producing between them a good many false antitheses. When he discusses, for instance, the Eucharistic sacrifice and the idea of priesthood, Dr Wedel plays off medieval distortions and Protestant repudiations, and tries to find a synthesis by removing what is mutually offensive without attempting to go behind and to discover a richer conception of which *both* versions are a parody.

2. While he pleads that the ecumenical movement must face the "challenge of historic Catholicism," Dr Wedel seems to me to miss the point of what it is that historic Catholicism can give—namely the Church as an already existing fact with marks of Catholicity and apostolicity *there already* to be received, responded to and lived out. He thinks in terms of the emergence of the "coming great church" by the pooling of the virtues of different traditions—a Church to be pieced together from the various portions of contemporary Christendom. It is surprising, in view of his commendation of Maurice, that he misses so largely the teaching of *The Kingdom of Christ* that the Church (for all its sins and distortions) already *is*, and that our deliverance into a future unity comes by our recognition of Scripture, Creed, Sacraments and Episcopate as the "signs of a spiritual and universal constitution" already given. In this connexion Dr Wedel's concluding plea for ecclesiastical repentance seems to be confused: for what is involved in the adherents of episcopacy repenting of their arrogance? It is one thing to go on believing in the high claims of the bishop's office—and to be humbled by the acknowledgment of one's unworthiness of it and of one's arrogant use of it. It is another thing to suppose that repentance must involve an abandonment of belief in the high claims of the office. In a highly rhetorical passage Dr Wedel slides from the former conception to the latter—unlike Maurice, who saw in the high doctrine of the office the protest against those who used it in proud and un-Christian ways.

3. The treatment of the ministry seems very confused. It is a good point (pp. 122-124) that features of the primitive Bishop are to be seen in many types of Church order to-day, including the Minister presiding at the Lord's Supper in the Congregationalist polity. But the discussion soon gets bogged by false antitheses. Dr Wedel plays off the ideas of a priesthood based on a succession in the transmission of grace against the idea of a representative priesthood deriving its authority from the Body; and he concludes that the former must be rejected, and that the latter is correct and does not necessarily involve succession in ordination. It is curious that, while he quotes such writers as Moberly and Gore, he makes no use of what these theologians have done to deliver us from the false antithesis—and, indeed, he places both of them most unfairly on one side of his false dilemma (p. 146). Though he quotes from Dr Temple's address to the convocations in December, 1943, he omits the most significant

words in which the Archbishop expressed the unity of the successional and the representative ideas. "When I consecrate a man to the office and rank of a Bishop in the Church of God, I do not act as a representative of the Church, if by that is meant the whole number of contemporary Christians, but I do act as the ministerial instrument of Christ in His Body the Church. The authority by which I act is His, transmitted to me through His Apostles and those to whom they committed it; I hold it neither from the Church nor apart from the Church, but from Christ in His Church." If these words represent what historic Catholicism has to give, it can only be said that Dr Wedel's discussion obscures it from the sight of his readers.

A disappointing book. It shows us much that we must learn from one another and criticize in ourselves. But, if an advance is to be made in the bringing together of the diverse traditions, it must be seen that Protestantism raises deeper questions than Dr Wedel discusses, and that historic Catholicism queries the whole idea of the Church as something that is "coming."

Michael Ramsey.
The College, Durham.

Our Culture: Its Christian Roots and Present Crisis. Edited by V. A. Demant. S.P.C.K. 5s.

This is the second series of Edward Alleyn Lectures, delivered at Dulwich College under difficulties from flying bombs in 1944-5, and apparently published under difficulties, too, for the preface is dated May, 1946, the publication 1947, and it reached us for review in 1948.

Consequently, although the subject is apt to the moment, when European Union is looking for a soul, and some expect that "the Churches" should provide one, the book is already a little dated. Was it unfair to turn first to Maurice Reckitt's lecture, to see whether the exponent of Christian work had had any inkling of this trouble about paying for imports? Alas, he knew no more about it than anyone else; he was still worried chiefly about the dangers of a policy of full employment in a world of plenty, and was allowing himself only a short-term comfort from the hope that for a period after the war "the job will look for the man (as ideally it always ought to do)." He was still thinking about a surplus of wealth inherited from former generations, which could be distributed unconditionally through some kind of monetary reform, as a "social dividend."

The trouble with these composite books is that each speaker is chosen to do his or her own stuff, and one is haunted by the feeling of having read it all before. Miss Sayers' application of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity to Art has indeed been most enlightening; and so one looks to see whether she is writing about that, and sure enough she is. (This essay appears also in *Unpopular Opinions*.) Christopher Dawson deals in terms of education with the break-up of the medieval synthesis, and hopes there is sufficient life in the "sacred tradition" to render possible a recovery of Christian culture. Dr Demant is always impressive, if you are alert enough to de-junk his sentences,

and if you have not read the other works of his to which he refers you. We must indeed recover the theology of natural life without losing the "tension," which alone can prevent Christians from merely trying to "sweeten the social drift" (*sic*).

Only Professor Hodges caused excitement and surprise, and found (what was to me) a new track through this much-travelled piece of country. Neither in medieval nor in post-renaissance times did Christianity determine the form of society or of its ideas. What it did was to accept and bless the given order, by putting it in a wider setting. The hierarchical order of the Middle Ages was seen to be part of a universal order depending upon God; the era of free competition in commerce and thought (when all frontiers were open and there appeared to be plenty of room for all) was interpreted as witnessing to the union of infinite power with infinite wisdom and goodness. But some of the most challenging parts of Christianity were lost sight of in the liberal period, and the Protestant opposition (*e.g.* Methodism) amounted to little more than an attempt to shoot the pianist. Philosophy necessarily failed to produce the all-embracing harmony which was expected of it, and the liberal order of thought disintegrated with its world. Sooner or later a new stable society will take shape. (Why?) It will not be created by Christian initiative, any more than its predecessors, but will stand over against Christianity as a given objective fact. There is still a hope that Christianity will accept and bless it, by setting its principles in a wider context and relating them to God. But it will not be any form of Christianity now known which will perform the work.

This is nearly prophecy, but not quite. A prophet should (in Professor Hodges' words) "give some hint of the nature of the new life which lies beyond the present shadow of death. But . . . to speak a positive word to our condition, the Church would need to have seen into the future." Until the positive word has been given or the new pattern has emerged from the passage of events, there is a limit to the amount that can usefully be written about what "we must have," "we must ensure." Such diet makes for alternate spasms of distended and deflated hopes. We should bring out from the bag the secret formula which the Church has always known, the secret of how to live without a future.

T. R. Milford.

Lincoln.

Can Two Walk Together?—The Quest for a Secular Morality. By Ian Henderson. Nisbet. 10s.

The Holy Spirit and Ourselves. By G. F. Nuttall. Blackwell. 5s.

"Since the *ersatz* religions of Racialism and Communism have come to power in other lands," writes Mr Henderson, "the Western democracies have been concerned with the question whether practical co-operation with them is possible even where there is no dogmatic agreement." He adds, to forestall criticism, "The importance of the subject rather than the adequacy of its treatment is the justification for this book." There can be no doubt about the importance of

the subject, but the merit of any book depends also on its treatment. Here I am in two minds. What Mr Henderson has done is to discredit both the idea that morals are primary and that dogmas follow from them, and also the idea that dogmas are primary and that morals follow from them. He does this by means of a knowledgeable if not always convincing study of Natural Law, Lord Lindsay, F. H. Bradley, Emil Brunner, of Western Dogma by means of Knox, Buchanan, the author of the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos* and Rutherford, and of Mackinder's *Democratic Ideals and Reality*. The chapter on Western dogma is, in my judgment, the most rewarding. Now I cannot really say that this is a good book. The issues are difficult enough in all conscience, but there is no need for us to be led into quite the muddle Mr Henderson propounds. My impression from reading the book is that he has taken the full strain of the difference between British and Continental modes of thinking and has been left in a state in which he cannot trust either. (Incidentally I hold that his German quotations should have been given in English—there are many students of theological issues who have the intelligence to read more exacting books than this of Mr Henderson's who have no command of foreign languages.) But for the very reason that he leaves blocked every road to an answer of the questions he raises, his book may do useful service. There are many Christians whose minds are not awake to the full complexity of the theological issues raised by the relation of the fact of Christ to the modern world. As a book calculated to wake them from dogmatic slumber, I commend Mr Henderson's work. But it should not be so negative. If we start from the position that "our morals can either be a criterion or a consequence of our dogmas, they cannot be both," we are asking for trouble. I gather from the end of the book that Mr Henderson believes in Natural Law and Christianity. It is almost incredible, but true, that he explains neither the ground for this double conviction nor the interrelation of the parts. We manifestly need a better book on the same subject.

Dr Nuttall's book on the Holy Spirit is a more satisfying work. He is a Congregationalist, and author of a previous work on *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*. I cannot think that any Christian reader would not be moved to gratitude for the personal presence of the Holy Spirit by these fluent and penetrating addresses. The best chapter is that on the discipline of the Spirit, and the weakest that on the community of the Spirit. Theologically, two comments may be made. One is that Dr Nuttall falls into the fallacy of supposing that because the end of living is personal life, God does not act personally towards us by means of things. The other comment I would wish to make is that the book raises the issue which Charles Williams wrestled with, if not with complete success, in *The Descent of the Dove*. How has the Holy Spirit acted in the history of the Church? And here I can only say that I think that Dr Nuttall's implicit view of Church history is as one-sided in one direction as, for example, the present Bishop of London's *History of the Modern Church* is in the other.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

God and Men. By Herbert H. Farmer. (Lynam Beecher Lectures at the Divinity School of Yale University, 1946.) Nisbet. 10s. 6d.

Awake in Heaven. By Gerald Vann, O.P. 7s. 6d.

Man, as Dr Farmer points out, is inclined to take himself—his nature and his faculties—for granted. In an age in which many circumstances are combining to reduce human beings to a condition of sub-humanity, such an attitude is particularly dangerous. Dr Farmer and Fr Vann both recognize that there is no more urgent question to-day than the question "What is Man?" and that the answer can be provided only by the Christian Faith. Yet, because at the centre of the Christian faith is set the Incarnation, the Christian doctrine of Man cannot be considered in isolation from the Christian doctrine of God. Both these books are attempts to restate the specifically Christian beliefs about Man and God in terms intelligible to modern believers and inquirers. In the broad arrangement of their material they are at one, for each deals first with Man and then with God (an order which, it is hoped, will not confirm in their error a generation whose presuppositions are still predominantly humanist!). But if there is similarity between the two in their general arrangement, it frequently does not extend to their treatment of particular points: though the books substantially cover the same ground, they are essentially complementary to one another.

Dr Farmer does not allow the reader entirely to escape from the atmosphere of the lecture room in which the subject matter of his book was originally delivered. A certain academic formality, which is reflected in both the title and the substance of the introductory chapter ("The Way of Knowledge"), is sustained throughout the book. But if his style is, at times, homiletic, Dr Farmer is by no means dull, and his subject gives him no scope for indulgence or vague abstractions. His concern is with *persons*—with their relations with God and with one another—and with the complex variety of dangers by which human personality finds itself threatened in the world of to-day. He makes it clear that right relations between human persons can ultimately derive only from their loving relationship with a God who is Himself Personal; but his further statement that "God's claim on me meets me *always* in and through the claim of my neighbour" (p. 53) is surely inadmissible. Our love for God certainly *includes* our love for our fellows, but is never exhausted by it; it must, for example, find further expression in our worship. The author's argument here would have gained in clarity if he had been prepared to give an explicit definition of personality: and it appears strange that he makes no reference to the relations of the three Persons in the one Godhead; indeed, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, though very relevant to his thesis, is never mentioned. In fact, although he has some valuable things to say about Man, Dr Farmer is far happier when he passes on to consider the doctrine of God, and his later chapters on the attributes of God are admirable. It is surprising, however, that he gives less than two pages to his consideration of the Church, in spite of the fact that he admits "that the idea of the Church

is part of the Christian doctrine of God" (p. 142). This seems to confirm an impression that, in spite of his insistence on personal relationships, Dr Farmer tends to think of persons rather as individuals than as members of society.

Finally, the style of much of the book is pedestrian, and the construction of some of the sentences is clumsy in the extreme. But in spite of these defects the book will be of particular value to those whom its author has primarily in mind—those who are called to preach the Gospel in, and to, the modern world; whether or not it will make a wider appeal is open to doubt.

If the title *God and Men* suggests the formality of the lecture room, the quotation from Traherne from which Fr Vann selects that of his book suggests, perhaps, the warmth and intimacy of the retreat house. This difference in tone, suggested by the title, is reproduced in the book itself: if a distinction used by Fr Vann himself may be borrowed, we can say that he gives us *vision* where Dr. Farmer gives us *information*. The book is an adaptation of material provided by talks and addresses given on various occasions; some inconsistency, therefore, in the quality of the contents is to be expected. In general (and again unlike Dr. Farmer) Fr Vann is more successful in his treatment of the doctrine of Man than in dealing with the doctrine of God. The technical defence of Causality (in chapter 5) and the chapter on Dogma and Freedom (which is unlikely to impress any outside the author's own communion) might well have been omitted from a work which is obviously designed to have more than a limited appeal. But the early part of the book, which deals with the nature of Man, and the later chapters, dealing with some of the common moral problems by which man finds himself confronted to-day, are excellent. It is to be hoped that many, clergy and laity alike, will read the important things which Fr Vann has to say about marriage, education, and other urgent matters; his teaching is attractively and cogently expressed.

Edward Knapp-Fisher.

Cuddesdon.

Jesus, Son of Man. By George S. Duncan. Nisbet. 16s.

This book is far too good to miss. Dr Duncan's gift for lucid exposition matches his learning. There are many things with which to disagree; but the claim that the Gospels still yield a reliable portrait of our Lord, defended in a brilliant sketch of the development of Gospel criticism, is so convincingly demonstrated in the body of the book that the reader's first and most enduring reaction must be delighted admiration of a fine piece of theological writing. Dr Duncan is incapable of taking up any theme, whether it be Form Criticism, the Fatherhood of God, or "realized eschatology," without going straight to the really important questions and answering them in a way that shows up the triviality of much that is said and written about these matters.

The conclusions that emerge from his study are, in his own words, that "any interpretation of Jesus which questions the uniqueness of

His relation to God and His own recognition of that uniqueness is shipwrecked on the rocks of the New Testament evidence," but that "it was no part of His purpose to arrogate to Himself a title in explanation of His authority." Dr Duncan believes this last to be vital, not only to the proper understanding of the life of Jesus but also "for a fresh appreciation of His significance for the world of to-day." He neither invites nor accepts any title in explanation of His authority.

It is at this point that Dr Duncan seems to do less than justice to the Gospel evidence and also to the faith of the Church, in the light of which, as he allows, the Gospels must be read if they are to be understood. The metaphors of Father and Son are far from exhausted by the meaning he finds in them; it is very difficult in view of St Mark's evidence to avoid the conclusion that our Lord did invite His disciples to explain His authority, and that before the Sanhedrin He accepted the title of Messiah; and Daniel vii had surely more to do with His use of *Son of Man* than is here suggested. If this is so, it would seem that it is only in the light of the faith of Chalcedon that the Gospels can be properly read. Dr Duncan does not appear to go so far. Of Jesus he says: "Such a man is not to be explained solely, or even primarily, in terms of human origins; He must be explained by reference to the God whose image He bears, whose Spirit fills His being, and who therefore is *in a very real sense* incarnate in Him" (reviewer's italics). But not, apparently, in the sense which the Church has always supposed.

Occasionally there are statements made for which no evidence is offered—*e.g.*, on page 104, where the allusion must be to the historical ministry, it is stated that Jesus communicated to others the Spirit He had Himself received at the Baptism.

G. O. Williams.

Bangor.

The "De Incarnatione" of Athanasius, the Short Recension. By R. P. Casey. (Studies and Documents, XIV, Part 2.) Christophers. 15s.

The *De Incarnatione* is so popular a "prescribed text" in university studies that many readers of Theology may be interested in the progress of what might otherwise seem a severely academic discussion. Bishop Roberston's text, on which many of us were brought up, represents what is now called the Long Recension. In 1925, however, Lebon drew attention to the existence of a Short Recension, of which four MSS are now known. After preliminary studies and collations by Kirsopp Lake and R. P. Casey in the *Harvard Theological Review*, 1926 and 1930, a full edition was undertaken by Casey and G. J. Ryan for the series *Studies and Documents*. Ryan published a study and new collations of the Long Recension MSS as Part 1 of Vol. XIV (1945), which has now been followed by Casey's work on the Short Recension (XIV, 2, dated 1946, but issued later?).

On opening Casey's volume, the reader will perhaps wonder, not only what he is to think about the Short Recension, but also

where it is! Some two-thirds of the space is given up to a reprint of Robertson's text. The rest consists of a six-page collation of one MS (d=Athos, Dochiariou 78, fourteenth century), with a thirty-page introduction which embodies some patristic quotations (those from Severus of Antioch are notable), and specimen readings or inferences from the Syriac version, which Casey considers the best witness to the Short text. But no collation of the Syriac is given, and no attempt has been made to construct a text of the Short Recension.

Textual evidence proves that both recensions were in circulation in the fifth and sixth centuries; both were quoted by theologians concerned with Christology; and it is clear that, at least, the new MSS will help to improve the text of the Long Recension. As to the Short, in 1926 Lake and Casey believed it to be the original. In 1930 Casey upheld the priority of the Long Recension, as he still does in the present work. He attributes the Short to Athanasius himself or one of his immediate circle. Lake, however, in a prefatory note to XIV, 1, holds that, if both versions are Athanasian, the Short Recension is the earlier; but that this may be the work of an Apollinarian contemporary. Lebon also believed the Short Recension to be a moderate Apollinarian revision.

It is difficult to count either version deliberately Apollinarian. The variants are often interesting, but many are purely stylistic, and some which are dogmatic are thoroughly Athanasian, resembling rather an author's hesitant alternatives or second thoughts than a single-minded dogmatic revision. It has always been obvious that in this work the Christology of Athanasius is unsatisfactory, or at least badly expressed, and he may have been feeling after his terminology.

In a long and valuable review published in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan.-April, 1948, Dr F. L. Cross notes that d has two unique, but quite Athanasian, passages; which suggests a third recension. He thinks it probable that Athanasius several times revised this early work. He also rightly warns us that no safe conclusions can be drawn until the Syriac text is available. Casey's work is a step forward, but inconclusive in itself. Meanwhile, those who are interested should study Dr Cross's review and may also consult an article by Edgar Smothers, S.J., in the *Harvard Theological Review*, 1948.

S. L. GREENSLADE.

DURHAM.

SHORTER NOTICES

Another 200 Sermon Notes. By F. H. Drinkwater. Burns Oates. 15s.

Used with discretion and discernment this is a useful book for the busy parish priest. It appeals by reason of its simple language and interesting arrangement and has at least two very useful "courses." The sermons on "Marriage" are particularly good, and those "For the Boy Preacher" are attractive, though a little "precious."

G. K. D.

Whom They Pierced. By Mervyn Stockwood. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

No professing Christian could read this little book without a great deal of "heart-searching." "It brings with it the atmosphere of the Three Hours' Service," and everything is related to real life. The reader is placed in the Palm Sunday crowd among "many who wave palms and shout 'Hosanna,' [but] are not prepared to take risks or to do anything which might jeopardize their futures." Although published as the Bishop of London's Lent Book, it might be read with profit at any time, for each chapter contains an urgent challenge:

". . . as we stand beneath the cross, we are not witnessing something which happened and finished hundreds of years ago; rather we are taking part in something which concerns us now."

Mr Stockwood writes with conviction, and often his portrayal of "christian" conduct is uncomfortably true.

J. L. BADGER.

BRIDLINGTON.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Your reviewer, M.B., sees fit to imply that in *Essays Presented to Charles Williams* I (among others) have been so impertinent, or so maladroit, as to offer to the memory of a man I respected a gift that he would have disliked had he been alive to receive it. I may therefore perhaps, without impropriety, mention in your columns how the essay that I contributed to that volume originated.

During the last year or so of Charles Williams's life I wrote to him a number of letters on the subject of the *Divina Commedia*, which I was then reading. On September 13, 1944, he wrote to me:

I very much hope that you will consider turning your letters into some sort of small pamphlet. I am convinced (and this seriously) that they might be of great use to a large and probably innocent public of whom a certain few might read (*a*) them and (*b*) Dante. And they might have their whole consciousness of Dante altered by reading you, and turned into a much happier and more truthful apprehension. It is this kind of thing which we need to encourage so much; less catholic culture and more poetic intelligence.

I agreed to this proposal, on the understanding that he should edit the pamphlet; and he was preparing to do this when his death put an end to the project. When I was invited by Dr C. S. Lewis to contribute to the memorial volume, *pietas* seemed to dictate that I should write for it the kind of thing that Charles Williams himself had wished and requested me to write. Much of the substance of my original letters reappears in the essay, though expressed with more sobriety and arranged in a more orderly way than was necessary or possible in a correspondence meant only for his private eye.

While fully sharing Dante's dread of appearing "laudatore di me medesimo (laqual cosa è al postutto sconvenevole e biasimevole a chi 'l fa)," I have thought it well to let the opinion I have quoted stand

exactly as it was written. Your reviewer says that "we can guess" what Charles Williams would have thought of the essays presented to him. But since in this particular case guesswork happens to be unnecessary, I will suppose him scholar enough to prefer the evidence.

24, Newland Street,
Witham,
Essex.
June 14th, 1948.

Yours, etc.,

Dorothy L. Sayers.

The reviewer writes: "I am happy to learn that Miss Sayers wrote her piece at the actual instigation of C. W. Certainly, when in the body of my note I referred to the quality of the contributions in general, that by Miss Sayers was not one of those I had in mind. That my words should give the impression it was must be regretted, but I did not wish to particularize. Even though Miss Sayers was encouraged by C. W., I must maintain the opinion of her contribution which the note expressed, and I am afraid it is not my own opinion alone. It would, of course, have been idiotic to suggest that Williams would not have been touched by the presentation, and I did not suggest it."

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Bruce Publishing Co. (Milwaukie, U.S.A.): Donald Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East*, Vol. II ($4.00).

Church Book Room Press: F. W. Dillistone, *The Word of God and the People of God* (3s. 6d.); F. R. M. Hitchcock, *Transubstantiation* (6s.).

Dacre Press: A. E. Simpson, *So God Loved* (3s.); Horton Davies, *The Worship of the English Puritans* (25s.).

East and West Library: Cecil Roth, *A Short History of the Jewish People* (25s.).

Epworth Press: Edwin Lewis, *A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation* (15s.).

Friends of Lincoln Cathedral: J. H. Srawley, *The Origin and Growth of Cathedral Foundations as Illustrated by the Cathedral Church of Lincoln* (1s. 6d.).

Gollancz: James Parkes, *Judaism and Christianity* (10s. 6d.).

Hodder and Stoughton: Bishop of Chichester, *Christian Unity* (6s.); Archbishop of York, *Watchman, What of the Night?* (6s.).

Independent Press: P. T. Forsyth, *The Church and the Sacraments* (10s. 6d.); H. F. Lovell Cocks, *The Church in the Atomic Age* (9d.).

I.V.F.: G. W. Bromiley, *Biblical Criticism* (1s.).

Lutterworth Press: F. B. Flint, *Towards Christian Marriage* (3s.); J. W. Sweetman, *Islam and Christian Theology*, Part I, Vol. II (18s.).

Paternoster Press: R. E. D. Clark, *Darwin: Before and After* (6s.).

S.C.M. Press: Vernon Sproxton, *Watching Films* (2s.); G. L. Russell, *Men and Women* (6s.); F. B. Welbourn, *Science and Humanity* (4s.).

Sheed and Ward: Philip Hughes, *A History of the Church*, Vols. I and II (21s. and 25s.); Charles Journet, *The Dark Knowledge of God* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Ulrich Simon, *Theology of Crisis* (15s.); *Lambeth Occasional Reports*, 1931-8 (7s. 6d.); *Lambeth Conferences* (1867-1930) (10s. 6d.); *This Thy Family: Course V, Christian Life and Witness—Songs of the Family* (1s.); D. D. C. Barclay (Ed.), *Spirit of Youth: Children's Anthology* (8s. 6d.).

Vandenhoek and Ruprecht (Göttingen): H. J. Iwand, *Göttinger Predigt-Meditationen II*/3 (n.p.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher